1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA					
2	MIAMI DIVISION CASE NO. 24-CV-21119-RAR					
3						
4	DARRYL PAYNE,	Miami, Florida				
5	Plaintiff,	June 6, 2024				
6	VS.	10:21 a.m 11:02 a.m.				
7	ESSENTIAL MEDIA GROUP, LLC, et al.,					
8	Defendants.	Pages 1 to 42				
9						
10	ORAL ARGUMENT ON DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS BEFORE THE HONORABLE RODOLFO A. RUIZ, II					
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE					
12	APPEARANCES:					
13						
14	В	TERRY M. SANKS BEUSSE SANKS, PLLC				
15	S	157 New England Avenue Suite 375				
16	W	inter Park, Florida 32789				
17		RICHARD C. WOLFE WOLFE LAW MIAMI, P.A. 175 SE 7th Street Suite 2410				
18	1					
19	Miami, Florida 33130					
20	STENOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED BY:					
21	ILONA LUPOWITZ, RMR, CRR					
22	Official Court Reporter to: The Honorable Rodolfo A. Ruiz, II					
	United States District Court Southern District of Florida					
23	400 North Miami Avenue Room 11-2					
24	Miami, Florida 33128 (305) 523-5737					
25						

```
1
              (Call to the Order of the Court.)
             THE COURT: We are here in Case No. 24-21119. This is
 2
 3
     the matter of Payne versus Barwick, et al.
 4
             Let's get appearances please, beginning with
 5
     plaintiff's counsel.
             MR. SANKS: Terry Sanks, from Beusse Sanks, on behalf
 6
 7
     of the plaintiffs.
 8
             THE COURT: All right. Good morning, Mr. Sanks.
 9
             And on behalf of Barwick? Really, it's the Essential
10
     Media Group, Rama Barwick, Paul Klein, Sharon Klein, and The
11
     Orchard Enterprises.
12
             MR. WOLFE: Good morning, Your Honor; Richard Wolfe.
     represent all the defendants.
13
14
             THE COURT: All right. Good morning, Mr. Wolfe.
             So we're here today to address the motion to dismiss
15
16
     that has been filed by the defendants. There's a couple of
17
     arguments we're going to work our way through this morning.
18
     Some of them are a little more pleading centric, and deal with
19
     the adequacy of the allegations, and then one in particular, I
20
     think, is a little more legal in that we're going to talk about
21
     the statute of limitations argument raised by the defense.
22
             I think the easiest way to go about this, Mr. Sanks, is
23
     just to jump into the structure of the complaint. I understand
24
     that you take an issue with the allegation that this has been
25
     framed as a shotgun complaint.
```

Now, I will tell you that I've poured through the complaint quite a bit, and I think we do have, at least as what I can see, as one, quote-unquote, "shotgun problem," and that's what we know as the fourth category of shotgun pleading in Weiland, which is our seminal case from the Eleventh Circuit. And that is, when we assert, quote, "multiple claims against multiple defendants without specifying which of the defendants are responsible for which acts or omissions, or which of the defendants the claim is brought against." That's the one category, if you will, of shotgun pleading, that worries me.

I'm looking here, in front of me, at the complaint; in particular, paragraph 65 through 68, 89 through 93 of the amended complaint -- Docket Entry 14, I believe -- and I can't necessarily figure out what defendant of our four or five defendants here engaged in which specific acts or omissions.

So I'll just read you an example. Paragraph 43 of the complaint says: "In 2024, plaintiff learned that defendants, individually and/or collectively, have illegally copied, displayed, and made available for download, the Copywrited Work - without authorization - on the music platform, Spotify." The problem is, I can't figure out, from that allegation -- I think Mr. Wolfe shares the same concern -- who did what.

Was that really Rama Barwick? Was it the Kleins? Was it The Orchard? I can't really put my finger on who did what.

So can you address that? I mean, again, I will give

you leave to amend to correct this flaw, but you've maintained that I should be able to figure out, from this pleading, who committed what in the complaint, and I'm struggling with that.

Do you want to address that?

MR. SANKS: Yes, Your Honor. I guess to start with, before I touch on addressing that, today was the day we had an opportunity to amend our claim -- or our complaint, and we actually were going to file something. And then we opted,

let's go to this hearing, and let's see where you want to go

11 THE COURT: Okay.

with this --

MR. SANKS: -- before we file. So we're hoping we have at least some more time. I know in the order -- it's at Docket 22 -- the order itself said June 6th; yet, the email notice said July 6th. So we were a little confused, but we were going with your order on that.

THE COURT: For sure. And I will tell you this: No matter what, we're going to have to address the statute of limitations argument that I know Mr. Wolfe believes cannot be cured by amendment.

But putting that aside for a minute, certainly, no matter what, you will be granted leave to amend the pleadings, and the issues I'm addressing today, and we can decide and talk about how long you need on that. But this particular issue would certainly be one that I would hope we could amend and

parse out who did what.

So do you agree with me, that we can at least put a finer point on that?

MR. SANKS: I would prefer it so that we don't -- we're not here again.

THE COURT: Certainly. For judicial economy and to help you-all out, I would agree. I think it's the right call because -- I know you cited this BWP case for me, but I think that even in the BWP Media case, there was at least a little more nuance and explanation.

Here, when we talk about -- I point out, for example -- and I'll put this in a brief order for you. But this second part, just by way of example, paragraph 91, quote, "defendants individually and/or collectively had the right and ability to supervise the infringing conduct committed, as each had the right and ability to ensure proper authorization." That's the kind of thing that I'm worried about. It's pretty conclusory.

As far as I can tell, we can't just say every defendant engaged in every incident of vicarious infringement and direct infringement. It just puts Mr. Wolfe in a position to not know who committed what infringing conduct.

So if we're going to go back and amend this, can you make sure that we at least identify who is responsible for what?

MR. SANKS: I think why we stated it the way we stated

it -- and I apologize for the language we used. I'm also a patent attorney, and that's some of the language we use in writing patent claims.

So we state it that way because, at this point, we haven't taken discovery so we don't know exactly who is controlling. We know there are three member managers. We don't know who has more control over Essential than the other two. So that's why we stated it the way that we stated it. We believe that once we get into discovery, we would -- all that would bear out.

THE COURT: And I definitely don't want to have you leave court thinking that we're going to raise the pleading burden. Right? I agree with you. We've got to get through Twombly. We need enough to state a viable claim. So I don't want you to think heightened pleading standard here.

I think that just a little bit more, though, in terms of -- even if it is, quite frankly, that you want to attribute the same conduct to everyone, there just needs to be a little more of a fleshing out of that because, as it's written now, everyone is just lumped in together.

So, for example, if we get through discovery later, and we find that someone, for example, is not going to be held responsible for infringement, by parsing out the counts, we can do partial summary judgment, or we can try to parse out who's liable for what.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
So one of the things I'll tell you is -- as you're
pointing out to me, the discovery might assist you. And I
don't know how much you know at this stage, but there's kind of
a failure to delineate the relationships a little bit, right,
in the sense of -- between Essential and Orchard and between
Orchard and each individually named defendant.
        So that's been a challenge for me, to understand those
relationships. It sounds like you may have some idea, based on
the member manager, et cetera, and maybe we can add that in.
I'm not asking you to have an exact blueprint of it, but my
hope is we could amend that.
        MR. SANKS: All right. Our current -- again, we
didn't file --
        THE COURT: But you have a draft, though, right?
        MR. SANKS:
                    We're up to 53 counts. We have separated
each count per individual.
        THE COURT: That helps a lot.
        MR. SANKS: Arguing even in the alternative because,
again, at this point we do not know.
        THE COURT:
                    That's fair to me. That's fine.
        Let me ask you, while we're on this subject -- because
I think you already have an amendment in progress -- there's an
issue here on the vicarious infringement claim. Mr. Wolfe has
pointed out Count 3 should be dismissed, page 5 through 8 of
his motion.
```

I think we all agree, by the way, that the Eleventh Circuit has made it clear that you have to have the right and ability to supervise the infringing activity, and you must have a direct financial interest. Those are the two requirements. And we need to have some allegations, for example, when it comes to direct financial interests, that the defendant profited directly from the infringing activity.

In the draft that you're currently putting together,
I'm hopeful that we will have some amendment as to a little bit
of the conclusory language in Count 3. At least as it's worded
right now, it just simply says that defendants obtained a legal
profit, which is alleged in the infringements, but I don't have
anything in there about financial interest or defendant's role
in the alleged infringement. And I think -- and I remember
going back -- your response actually does start to add detail
concerning the financial interests of The Orchard defendant.
But, of course, I can't consider that by way of a response. So
if it's in the actual complaint, certainly, that would clarify.

Is that something that you're going to add?

MR. SANKS: That is something we're going to add.

Also, in Mr. Wolf's motion, he was specific about The Orchard not being -- their vicarious liability count, we're actually removing that.

THE COURT: Very good. So you've gone a little step ahead of me on that, as well.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
I think this is a little bit of the same point, and
maybe this has already been cured: You pointed out, in page 7
of your response, this issue with The Orchard as to vicarious
liability. But I take it that you're going to clean up a
little bit about the right to supervise or control because
that's one of the issues. You've pointed out this relationship
between Essential and The Orchard, but I do definitely need a
little more supervision, or control element, that you need for
vicarious infringement, that second element. I would need
something like that fleshed out, and that's something you're
able to do?
        MR. SANKS: Yes, Your Honor.
        THE COURT: Okay, excellent.
        MR. SANKS: Again, like I said, with respect to The
Orchard we're taking them out of --
        THE COURT: So that's not an even an issue.
        So Mr. Wolfe, before we get to the issue, more
particularly, about the statute of limitations, are you
satisfied -- it sounds like I think we have a game plan here on
an amendment. Mr. Sanks has already taken care of a few of
these concerns, and I want to give him leave to do so.
        We're going to talk now about the
statute-of-limitations defense that you believe cannot be
remedied by amendment, but I want to make sure that I've
covered all the pleading sufficiency arguments you've raised
```

```
1
     that I think Mr. Sanks is going to address.
 2
             MR. WOLFE:
                         Thank you, Your Honor. Last night I filed
 3
     a notice of supplemental authority.
             THE COURT: I saw that.
 4
 5
                         It's a case that I'm litigating in the
             MR. WOLFE:
     Central District of California. It's the biggest copyright
 6
 7
     case in the country right now.
                         Bigger than Nealy v. Warner Brothers?
 8
             THE COURT:
 9
             MR. WOLFE: Bigger than Nealy, and I'll tell you why.
             THE COURT: By the way, inside joke. I was on Nealy,
10
11
     and the Supreme Court disagreed with me. So I'm reliving
12
     Nealy.
13
             MR. WOLFE: But we agreed with you.
14
                         I'm really glad you said that. Because
             THE COURT:
     I've been telling everybody --
15
16
             MR. WOLFE: You know, I'm on Nealy now too.
17
             THE COURT:
                         I know. But I'm just saying, I'm glad that
18
     someone will defend me. Because I keep telling everybody, I
19
     got three votes. Technically, it's six, three. We had a
20
     running bet that it was going to be nine, zero, so I did okay.
21
             MR. WOLFE: So let me explain why I think Cleveland
22
     Constantine Browne is on point and why I would urge Mr. Sanks,
23
     when he amends, to leave off not only The Orchards, but the
     three individuals.
24
             As I was saying, what that case is about is, the
25
```

plaintiff has sued 600 defendants over 1,700 copyrights. In that case, I represent a who's who of Latin music, from Maluma on down. And at page 35 of the opinion, it came out -- they followed the law that I've cited, color and sound, primarily, being the case. And Mr. Sanks has to give very detailed pleading as to the three individuals.

And Your Honor, I've expressed to him, essential is the company. If everything that he says is right, essential is the proper defendant. It's a prominent company. I've represented them for 30 years. I had hair when I started representing them. They have 80,000 recordings.

So to bring in the owners of the company is really unnecessary, and it creates a whole bunch of litigation that, quite frankly, doesn't benefit him. It doesn't give him a collectable defendant because, if everything he says is right, he has a collectible defendant.

So I would urge him, rather than guessing about who did what -- and Your Honor is absolutely correct. They have to prove and they have to plead that each one of these individuals were directly involved in the alleged infringing activities, and they all have a direct financial interest. And being the owner of the company is an indirect financial interest. If the company's profitable, and it pays them a profit, distribution, that's an indirect distribution, and it doesn't satisfy the requirements on the law.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I would urge Mr. Sanks, when he re-pleads, if we get there -- and we're going to deal with the issue of the statute of limitations -- to think long and hard about that because we're going to have a whole bunch of litigation that, in my opinion, is unnecessary. THE COURT: Yeah, I looked at it last night. page -- I think, really, it's pages 35 to 37 --MR. WOLFE: That's where it starts. THE COURT: -- where it really starts. And there's a pretty good discussion about the control element of vicarious copyright infringement. Certainly, there's some good language in here, and it deals with, like we're dealing with today, some pleading standards, under Rule 8, to try to explain how to sufficiently allege a viable claim for that within Rule 8. So we're going to need some allegations there just to kind of parse out that direct versus vicarious liability. So I would agree. Certainly, Mr. Sanks, as you're going through an amendment, you know, this has some additional guidance that I think is -- at least, as I read it, pretty in line from what I've seen from my circuit. So certainly, I would encourage that if we can try to track this a little bit, in its guidance, it's probably a good thing. So we'll take a look at that. MR. WOLFE: And Your Honor, you're right. Page 35

through 40 were in my favor, but pages 1 through 35, not so

1 much. 2 THE COURT: Right. That's fair. 3 So let me ask you, Mr. Wolfe -- let me tell you, I quess, what I'm seeing on the statute of limitations part. 4 5 So I'm reading from the complaint. And I don't know; 6 maybe there will be more in the draft that Mr. Sanks is coming 7 up with now. But I think we can all agree that there is an 8 allegation -- this is on or about -- let's see. It's 9 paragraph 26: "Beginning in December of 2020, Plaintiff became 10 aware that Defendant Essential Media Group and their agents 11 were copying, displaying, and distributing the Copywrited Work 12 without authorization." 13 Then, you go on -- and the complaint, later on -- and I 14 think this was added because I think this is the amended complaint. The original did not have this. But paragraph 43 15 16 then adds that plaintiff has learned in 2024 -- let me not omit 17 the most important part: "In 2024, Plaintiff has learned that 18 Defendants, individually and/or collectively, have illegally 19 copied, displayed, and made available for download the 20 Copywrited Work - without authorization - on the music platform 21 Spotify." So you've pointed out -- and, I think, correctly --22 23 that in the event this is what we call an ownership claim, 24 there is really very black-and-white allegations that the 25 plaintiff was aware of this infringement back in 2020. And

with the statute of limitations, that means that he would be outside the range of being able to file suit.

The challenge I'm having -- I've looked at a couple of cases, some you've cited, and additional ones beyond those.

You've pointed out the Lott-Johnson case; I think, Webster v.

Abbot; Black Box Royalties, which is probably one of the better ones. I think all of them stand for the proposition -- and I don't think Mr. Sanks is going to disagree with this -- that when the gravamen of a plaintiff's copyright claim is ownership, because plaintiffs assert that the defendants have no right to copy, sell, distribute, or license, any of the disputed songs, then we are falling within the statute of limitations problem you've pointed out.

And look, the *Black Box* case -- and *Webster* actually talks about this -- they point out that there the complaint plaintiff had styled was one of copyright infringement, but it was undisputed that the heart of the case concerned creation and ownership.

The challenge I'm having is, if it is not an ownership claim, if that's not the gravamen of the suit here, and it is one purely as to licensing, then having a new discovery, in 2024, of infringement would restart or enable to clock the start so that Mr. Sanks's clients would not be boxed out of bringing a suit.

The challenge I'm having -- you've advocated and said,

this is, at its core, an ownership claim, a freestanding ownership claim; it should be time barred.

But when I looked at the complaint carefully, I don't think there's any dispute as to ownership. I think everyone here agrees that this plaintiff -- Payne has owned these works. They licensed a bunch of them to Essential, and Payne is now saying that in that licensing agreement, one of the works that Essential is utilizing, on Spotify and elsewhere, was not part of the arrangement of licensing between plaintiff and defendants.

So if it's a licensing issue, or a sublicensing issue, it wouldn't, I don't think, be, at its core, a copyright ownership issue.

So tell me -- because I think, without me finding that it is an ownership issue, your argument doesn't fit. Right?

So I guess the core question is, what kind of claiming are we dealing with here; is it ownership or licensing? It looks like it's a licensing fight.

Tell me how it's ownership.

MR. WOLFE: I don't disagree with you. I think you're absolutely correct. I think it's a licensing issue.

And Your Honor knows, from the other case you remanded back to state case, that there was an extensive license between their client, Essential. We have all of these recordings. And now they claim there's this other one, "It's Alright," that was

```
1
 2
             THE COURT: That wasn't part of the bundle of sticks in
 3
     the beginning.
             MR. WOLFE: We disagree with it, but that's for another
 4
 5
     day.
             And I agree with you. It's not an ownership claim;
 6
 7
     it's a licensing claim.
             So how do we reconcile what you've just said with the
 8
 9
     pleadings? And I think it's easy. I think the limitation to
10
     the claim is what was put on Spotify.
11
             And remember, since they don't have a timely-registered
12
     copywrite, we're down to damages under 504(b), which is actual
13
     damages, which comes to --
14
             THE COURT: A thousand bucks, that's what you told me.
             MR. WOLFE: I don't even think it's a thousand bucks.
15
16
     I think I paid more for parking than what their claim is.
             I think at the end of the day, under 504(b), they're
17
18
     entitled to disgorgement of the limited amount of money that we
19
     made from Spotify. I'd be shocked if it's $10. And that's
20
     what we have a federal case about, $10.
21
             THE COURT: Well, let me ask you -- I'm nothing if not
22
    pragmatic. So I agree with you.
23
             Let me ask you, Mr. Sanks: I see you nodding.
24
     you agree that that is the core claim; it is a licensing claim.
25
     And I will tell you, I'm not going to find there's a
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

statute-of-limitation problem. And this has been very edifying and helpful for the Court because I think Mr. Wolfe, who's been in this space a long time, knows that this, at its core, is a licensing fight. That's what I saw when I remanded the action to state court too. So I don't know how much it is in damages, Mr. Sanks. I certainly can't figure out exactly what the streams are going to generate. But it just sounds to me -- Mr. Wolfe's kind of got the sense of the nature of the claim and the value of the I certainly -- even though I think you're going to have an amended complaint, and I'm happy to give you what you need, 14 days, or whatever, to file it. I'll issue an order today that memorializes what we've done. But I don't want to see us unnecessarily litigate. You have this -- I think you told me, Mr. Wolfe, if my memory serves me right, it's a straight up dec action in county court, right? That's correct, Your Honor. MR. WOLFE: THE COURT: Right. MR. WOLFE: And so where are we going to go? amend, they bring in this and other claims. Again, we're litigating over --

THE COURT: Well, here's what I want to say about that.

And I want to hear, Mr. Sanks, what you think about this. You

know, I've sent that back. They were, for lack of a better word, first filed.

My suggestion -- again, you tell me what you think.

Before we, you know, go to the mattresses here and litigate this, certainly, I want there to be a clean, operative complaint, and I'll give you leave to do that. But it just seems that I should wait, that this case should not continue -- put aside that the value of it may not be worth the effort on the litigation side, but the much cleaner declaration would, I believe, fundamentally, impact this case. Because if the county or state court finds that this particular work is part of the licensing that was done between the parties, then, certainly, that would impact your ability to recover here.

Right?

And I don't want to necessarily shut everything down here. I want you to amend. But I'm just wondering, should I not stay this case and ask you guys to give me updates every 60 days as to what's happening in state court while they figure out, based on the declaratory judgment, if this particular work is part of the license? Why not do that? I mean, why do you want to fight on this front?

Now, I'm with you, if you had kept it here. If the original -- if the one that you removed had stayed with me and, as I initially did, I consolidated it, then, of course, I would have had everything, and we would have gone forward. But now

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
that I've spliced it back, because I found there was no
supplemental jurisdictional basis to bring it over, why
wouldn't we amend, and then stay this case, and let that one
play out? What do you think?
        MR. SANKS: I think the contract that's at the state
court issue is clear.
        THE COURT: Okay.
        MR. SANKS: "It's Alright" is not in the agreement.
        THE COURT:
                    Okay.
                    The reason we brought the state court case
        MR. SANKS:
to federal court was because they've made that allegation --
Mr. Wolfe had sent us an email, which essentially -- in our
motion that we filed to move it to federal court, that's what
brought the two cases together.
        THE COURT: Right, that was the connection.
        MR. SANKS: If that wasn't there, we would not have
even made the attempt. We're not trying to duck state court.
I know you've basically said we have to pay attorney fees.
        THE COURT: Yeah.
        MR. SANKS: But it was based on what they did. It
wasn't -- so at this point, to stay this case, essentially,
does a disservice to the plaintiff.
        THE COURT: How? Tell me how. If your state court
case is debating whether the core issue -- because remember, if
the state court case is to determine whether the licensing
```

```
encompassed the work that is the core of this case, why would I engage in essentially a second track of litigation to figure that -- the answer to that question out here when the state court is looking into it?
```

I mean, to your point, it might be very easy, probably sounds like a straightforward summary judgment over there. If they're looking at contractual documents -- I mean, correct me if I'm wrong, but it can't be too hard to figure out if the copyrighted work was part of the license or not. Maybe it requires a little contractual interpretation. I think they also have a breach of contract over there with the dec action.

But why wouldn't I wait there and see if indeed there is a basis for the claim here? Because what worries me is, I think that the same question, that has been framed before the state court, would have to be answered here also; meaning, you are not going to be able to get any of the copywrite damages on Spotify if the license copied the work that you said they posted. And I don't want to be now second -- you know, a Monday morning quarterback or second-guessing another judge in the state system. We're both going to be -- have to answer the same question. It seems like it would be a waste of judicial economy, no?

MR. SANKS: I don't -- well, first, our amended complaint is up to 53 counts.

THE COURT: Yeah.

```
1
                         We had -- I mean, our second amended.
             MR. SANKS:
 2
             THE COURT:
                         The one that's coming.
 3
             MR. SANKS: The one that's coming. There are other
     copyrights that we're bringing in. There's unfair competition
 4
 5
     counts that we're bringing in, which are not related to that
 6
     case.
 7
             THE COURT: Okay. Do those counts -- does all of that
     flow from the determination, though, in state court? You're
 8
 9
     telling me there's a separate-and-apart claim that was --
10
             MR. SANKS: And I argue, they're -- just as we took the
11
     position --
12
             THE COURT: They're all intertwined.
             MR. SANKS: We said they became intertwined when
13
14
     defendant -- or, in the state court case, plaintiff --
     Mr. Wolfe said "It's Alright" is part of the agreement.
15
16
             THE COURT: Right.
17
             MR. SANKS: We still disagree. There is nothing in
18
     that contract that supports that.
19
             THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what, in the amended
20
     complaint you're going to file here, is separate and distinct
21
     from the question of whether "It's Alright" is part of the
22
     license. I'm going to suspect it flows from that. That's why
23
     I'm concerned.
             MR. SANKS: Well -- but I guess my point is, it only
24
25
     flows because they're now making an allegation after we filed a
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

doesn't impact "It's Alright."

federal case. THE COURT: Well, I would say this: I don't know the exact nature of the -- I don't have the state court complaint in front much. I guess -- my only concern is -- I mean, look, Mr. Wolfe doesn't have a motion in front of the Court on this point, so I don't want to sandbag anybody if you want to brief it or argue it. There are a number of discretionary doctrines that the Court could invoke to stay this case pending that case being litigated. It hasn't been raised. But I just thought, practically speaking, why wouldn't I put a pause button, let you file the 53-counter that's coming? But let me see what they say. Because if "It's Alright" -- I don't think you can tell me that a determination from the state court that's "It's Alright" is included the license wouldn't materially impact this case. It would. Maybe not the whole thing, but a big chunk of this case would have -a finding from the state court would guide or at least allow the Court to look at that and see if -- how many counts survive here. Right? MR. SANKS: Under what we're bringing, the majority of the counts will survive because they do not pertain to "It's Alright." THE COURT: So there's a lot of separated stuff that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
So let me ask you, Mr. Wolfe: I think that I'm not in
a position where I can get, maybe, everyone on the same page.
I would allow -- certainly, I'm going to give Mr. Sanks a
chance to amend. You have to see it. I have to see it. I
don't know what it looks like.
        Certainly, if there comes a time when I look at this
second amended complaint, and I feel like we're putting the
cart before the horse, I may ask the parties to either brief
that, or I may expect a motion in that regard by the potential
stay. I think I have quite a bit of discretion. If I think
"It's Alright" would have a material impact on this case, and
that's the first file, it just seems like it would be silly to
have you guys have to litigate over here and litigate over
there.
        We should pause this one, let that one get resolved,
and then come back to this case, decide what "It's Alright"
does to here, to this one, depending on what the judge does
over there. And then if there's, as Mr. Sanks says, other
claims, we can litigate those.
        What do you think? Sequentially, it seems a little
odd.
        MR. WOLFE:
                    I agree with you. I have not seen this
amended complaint.
        THE COURT: Yeah, I don't know.
```

MR. WOLFE: I don't know what these other copyrights

1 are. 2 THE COURT: Right. 3 MR. WOLFE: All I know is, we have a very robust licensing agreement. It even has a line in there that includes 4 5 anything else that they own. 6 So we specifically listed a couple of hundred 7 recordings that we licensed from them, and then it goes on to say, and anything else they have. 8 9 So whatever they have, we believe is going to be 10 subsumed within that agreement that's before Judge Barket. 11 Judge Barket will rule on my motion for declaratory relief, 12 and, if he rules in my favor, this case goes away. So I would agree with you. Let them amend. Let me see 13 14 what it is. Once I see it, I'll bring the appropriate motions. And I agree with you, it's not appropriate to argue it today. 15 16 I have plenty of time for that. 17 But again, Your Honor, I want to go back to the 18 practicalities of this. And I go back to 504(b). And, Your 19 Honor, I wrote the article for the Florida Bar Journal that 20 I've cited for him. At the end of the day, we're arguing about 21 nothing, pennies. 22 THE COURT: Well, let me talk about that second part, 23 because that's another thing we've got to talk about. We 24 definitely don't want to spend time and money. We've already

got an attorney fee motion that I believe has already been

filed.

And I want to be clear, Mr. Sanks: I don't want you to think, for a split second, that -- and I said this in the order, but if I wasn't clear enough in the order, I'll be clear today. There was no bad faith in the removal. That's why I pointed out in my citation that bad faith is not required for a award of fees. It's not to be punitive; it's simply to compensate the party that has had to defend against the removal.

I understood your reading of the supplemental jurisdiction statute. Certainly, I can see why, as we've talked about today, you would have believed there was enough overlap to put these cases together. So I don't want you to think there's any foul or harm in that.

Unfortunately, though, I do believe that exercising discretion was appropriate because, in my read of the supplemental jurisdiction statute, it speaks for itself, that there shouldn't have been removal. But I don't want you to think that, you know, I made an explicit finding of bad faith because of the sanction issue in state court.

Putting that aside, though, the next thing I want to talk about is Mr. Wolf's point on the money. I mean, certainly, even if the amended complaint's got other works, whatever that may be, the 504(b) issue is a real issue.

One thing that I'm going to suggest -- and I think it

would be worthwhile -- is whether you stay, or don't stay, if we get this amended complaint filed here in the next few weeks, so that we have an operating complaint, I respectfully suggest that I refer this case for settlement conference to the paired magistrate judge. It's cheaper. No mediation. Let's get a judge in here to look at it, and maybe they can work through these numbers.

And we should do that early. Because I agree with Mr. Wolfe; even with a bigger universe of claims in a 53-counter, if this is all through 504(b), and we have this kind of damage limitations under the Copyright Act, we should have another jurist step in. My paired magistrate judge, Judge Louis, is excellent. She would be happy to set this in the coming months. You guys can go in, have a good settlement conference. And at least, even if it doesn't resolve the case, we know the exact value of the case, and that may lead to other conversations, down the line, that might eliminate the need to move this extensively.

So I was thinking that we would have a deadline to amend. I'll ask you, Mr. Sanks, in a moment, what you need.

I'll issue an order memorializing everything we've discussed.

Then I'll issue a separate order referring you to a settlement conference, and have that be the thing that we deal with next.

As you've pointed out, Mr. Wolfe, I don't think anybody now wants to go through the exercise of a potential motion to

stay, and we've got to brief that, attorney time, attorney fees. What a waste. Why not try to see if -- if this is only something that's going to be a couple grand, whatever it is, we should be talking numbers before we waste time filing papers.

Mr. Sanks, are you amenable to just try and have a settlement conference once you amend the complaint?

MR. SANKS: Yes, Your Honor. I really think we need to do a settlement conference. The mediator we had selected -- I don't have an issue doing an early mediation. The mediator we selected is Mark Stein, outgoing president of the Business Law Section and IP attorney. He knows the law around this very well.

THE COURT: Well, I'll tell you this: I think the best thing to do is -- you-all let me know. Certainly, if you've got someone in the space -- not that my magistrate judge, like me, who have had an education from my time handling these cases, could handle it, I think, very well.

But certainly, if it's a dollars-and-cents issue, and you have someone who knows 504, I'm fine with doing an early mediation. Truthfully, I think the better thing to do is, if the parties would advise me of such, and instead of issuing a scheduling order, or getting into anything else, the Court then would order that the parties, after we go ahead and get this amended complaint filed, to schedule an early mediation and go forward with Stein.

```
1
             Do you think, Mr. Wolfe, that may make more sense?
 2
     What's your sense of it?
 3
             MR. WOLFE: I just went through a recent mediation
     conference with Magistrate Louis. She's terrific. And I would
 4
 5
     encourage you --
 6
             THE COURT: Let's do it. It's cost effective.
 7
             MR. WOLFE: It's cost effective. She's effective.
                                                                 And
     it's a great idea.
 8
 9
             THE COURT: All right. So here's what we're going to
     do, guys. I think we've got a good game plan here.
10
11
             Mr. Sanks, how long do you need? I know you've done
12
     your drafts. I'm not trying to jam anybody up in the summer.
13
     I've got Mr. Wolfe running around, getting ready for me. He's
     got other work in front of me, in short order.
14
             So how much time do you need to file the amended
15
     complaint?
16
17
             MR. SANKS: Originally, I was going to ask for that
     other date, the July 6th. My associate, who's doing all the
18
19
     work on this, just had their first child last week, so he's out
     for at least two weeks.
20
21
             THE COURT: So tell me, you need, two, three weeks?
22
             MR. SANKS: Yes, three weeks.
23
             THE COURT: Okay. I can give you three weeks. That's
24
     fine. I'm sure there's no objection to that.
25
             MR. SANKS: Thank you, Your Honor.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
THE COURT: We'll go ahead and give you that. Tomorrow
is the 7th. We'll give you the one, two, three -- the 20th.
So I'll set the amended complaint deadline for the 28th. And
then what I'll do is, I'll issue my order, set that deadline,
and by the same -- and it's not in the same order. But by
separate order, I'll refer the case to the settlement
conference. You guys will meet and confer with Magistrate
Judge Louis. Put something on the calendar that works for
you-all.
        What I would do is -- what we should think about is,
you'll probably get a settlement conference in the next month
or so. And if you guys want to ask, by way of joint motion,
that I either stay or extend the responsive deadline -- because
I don't want you filing another motion or filing an answer. We
can just pause, right? We have the amended complaint. Wait
until the settlement conference before you answer or file any
other responsive pleading. I will happily to do that.
might be easier to do that.
        What do you think, Mr. Sanks?
        MR. SANKS: I agree. I just have one other request.
        THE COURT: Yes, of course.
        MR. SANKS:
                    I appreciate what you said, because it was
clear, with respect to the attorney fee award.
        THE COURT:
                    Yes.
                    I'm going to ask if I could have permission
        MR. SANKS:
```

to file the motion asking for reconsideration, only from the standpoint, we had -- myself and Mr. Wolfe, we had a similar case, similar situation happened, and it was before the Chief Judge. And she actually did the same thing. She remanded it, but she took the position, kind of, what you said today: We didn't do it to duck state court; therefore, she did not award attorneys' fees.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SANKS: I at least would like to get that order, before you, so you could at least evaluate that in view of your order.

THE COURT: Sure, I have no problem. I'm happy to engage in the reconsideration.

I can tell you that, certainly, I would not have any sort of hearing or determination on the motion for fees until the settlement conference is had. We can put that on the side. Even if I disagree, and I say that a fee award is still appropriate, I'm not going to move on that until we go ahead and give you guys a chance to negotiate and work through a settlement conference.

But of course, I'm happy with you filing anything. I'm happy to read and reconsider anything that you may want me to look at. So feel free to file that.

I think the key for me is just trying to keep the costs low because I don't want to add more on top of the damage,

under 504, in terms of fees, which could easily eclipse the value of the case if we overlitigate it. And that's what I'm trying to do, strategically.

So I think we'll give you until the 28th. I'm happy to welcome any sort of reconsideration. I'll take a look at it, and then I will issue a separate order.

And I welcome that -- once the amended complaint is filed -- I'm certain that Judge Louis will be able to give you something in the coming months. I think that the parties should be prepared, by way of joint motion, to ask the Court to stay or essentially -- I think the best way to do it, actually, would be to stay any responsive pleading or answer until, let's say, 10 days after the parties have completed their settlement conference with the magistrate judge.

You know, that may be that best thing, Mr. Wolfe. So maybe you want to put that together with Mr. Sanks, and just let me know, and I'll have a placeholder so you don't worry about anything, other than the negotiation, before you have to file anything to the amended complaint. If you file that, I'll grant it and give you whatever you need.

I think by the time that Mr. Sanks files the amended complaint, we'll already have a date from Judge Louis as to what you guys could do for the settlement conference.

MR. WOLFE: And the settlement conference is going to be depending upon when the trial in Nealy is --

1 THE COURT: Correct. 2 MR. WOLFE: -- which I believe it's in the first or 3 second week of --THE COURT: Yeah, it's something we were talking about. 4 5 August is kind of what we've been playing around with. 6 Quite frankly, like I said, I may not go forward with 7 it if only because I know the parties may want to do the 8 mediation that they wanted -- you know, after we have the 9 couple of days, I think, in July where I set things that I'm 10 going to hear, I think the goal was -- and I'll listen to you 11 guys then. I'm tempted, because I heard you-all loud and clear 12 about the possibility of not putting it on a trial calendar 13 until the parties can effectively try to mediate. 14 MR. WOLFE: Just so you know, that's been set. We're going to mediate in front of Judge Hanzman. 15 16 THE COURT: Oh, wonderful. So in all likelihood, I would not want you ramping up for trial anyway. So I can 17 18 pretty much tell you, I'm not going to rush you to trial. You 19 can just worry about the hearings and, then, the mediation. 20 MR. WOLFE: And then I have my trial in front of Judge 21 Gayles in September so -- so much for my summer. 22 THE COURT: You have a busy few months. I know my 23 summer is starting to get chopped up quite a bit too. And hopefully I can tell Judge Louis -- I don't know her summer 24 25 schedule, but she just the other day got another one of my

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
cases, Fair Labor Standard Act case. She just found a date and
time, and worked with the parties really well in finding
something that would work for everybody. I have no doubt
she'll be able to do it for you guys too.
        MR. WOLFE: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
        THE COURT:
                    So Mr. Sanks, anything else? I think I've
got a good game plan here. I'll issue an order.
                                                 I'll hear
from you on the reconsideration. I'll wait to see what date
you guys get for the settlement conference, once I issue the
settlement conference order for Magistrate Judge Louis.
        MR. WOLFE: Thank you, Your Honor.
        MR. SANKS: Thank you, Your Honor.
        The only thing I have is a question for Mr. Wolfe:
        Since we're scheduling that hearing on July 2nd in
state court, would you mind just staying that until after the
settlement conference, as well? Because if we're going to
settle, you know we're going to settle this whole --
        THE COURT: Oh, if you're going to settle, it should
all be done universally.
        I will tell you, since it's before that judge, I don't
want to get involved.
        MR. SANKS: We haven't scheduled it yet.
        THE COURT: Who knows? I know scheduling in state
court can have its challenges. Maybe they don't even have that
date.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
But look, my view, going back to an earlier point, we
want to do it universally. We're trying to keep it cost
effective. I don't want anybody to spend time and money on
behalf of a client when there's a resolution to be had.
        I certainly think that once you guys get a date, if the
date is sometime in July, and it works, it might make more
sense for you-all to just postpone or pick a date a little
farther out before you go before the county court judge. I
leave it up to you guys to negotiate that.
        But I'll enter my orders, today or tomorrow, in order
to get my dates on the books. It will help you with everything
else.
                    Thank you, Your Honor.
        MR. SANKS:
                    Thank you, Your Honor.
        MR. WOLFE:
        THE COURT:
                    Okay, guys. Great to see you-all.
you, again, for the briefing. I'll get those orders out in the
next 48 hours or so.
                    Thank you, Your Honor. Good to see you.
        MR. WOLFE:
        THE COURT: Good to see you-all.
     (Court recessed at 11:02 a.m.)
                    CERTIFICATE
          I hereby certify that the foregoing is an
accurate transcription of the proceedings in the
```

1	above-entitled matter.
2	
3	DATE: June 19, 2024 /s/Ilona Lupowitz
4	ILONA LUPOWITZ, RMR, CRR Official Court Reporter
5	United States District Court Southern District of Florida
6	400 North Miami Avenue Room 11-2
7	Miami, Florida 33128 (305) 523-5737
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	1		
\$	<u>25:24, 26:10</u>	advise [1] - 27:21	aside [3] - 4:21, 18:8, 25:21
<u> </u>	504(b) [1] - 24:18	advocated [1] - 14:25	assert [2] - 3:6, 14:10
\$10 [2] - 16:19, 16:20	523-5737 [2] - 1:24, 35:7	<u>agents [1] - 13:10</u>	<u>assist [1] - 7:2</u>
_	53 [2] - 7:15, 20:24	agree [14] - 5:2, 5:7, 6:13,	associate[1] - 28:18
<u>/</u>	53-counter [2] - 22:12,	<u>8:1, 12:17, 13:7, 16:6, 16:22,</u>	<u>attempt [1] - 19:17</u>
Influence via 25:2	<u>26:10</u>	<u>16:24, 23:22, 24:13, 24:15,</u>	attorney [7] - 6:2, 19:18,
<u>/s/llona [1] - 35:3</u>		<u>26:8, 29:20</u>	<u>24:25, 27:1, 27:11, 29:23</u>
<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>agreed [1] - 10:13</u> <u>agreement [5] - 15:7, 19:8,</u>	<u>attorneys' [1] - 30:7</u> attribute [1] - 6:17
<u></u>	6 [1] - 1:5	21:15, 24:4, 24:10	August [1] - 32:5
<u>1 [2] - 1:8, 12:25</u>	60 [1] - 18:18	agrees [1] - 15:5	<u>authority[1] - 10:3</u>
<u>1,700 [1] - 11:1</u>	600 [1] - 11:1	ahead [4] - 8:25, 27:23,	authorization [4] - 3:20,
10 [1] - 31:13	<u>65 [1] - 3:12</u>	<u>29:1, 30:18</u>	5:16, 13:12, 13:20
<u> 10:21 [1] - 1:6</u>	<u>68</u> [1] - 3:12	<u>al [2] - 1:7, 2:3</u>	available [2] - 3:19, 13:19
11-2 [2] - 1:23, 35:6	6th [3] - 4:14, 4:15, 28:18	allegation [5] - 2:24, 3:21,	Avenue [3] - 1:14, 1:23,
11:02 [2] - 1:6, 34:20	_	<u>13:8, 19:11, 21:25</u>	<u>35:6</u>
14 [2] - 3:13, 17:13	<u>7</u>	allegations [4] - 2:19, 8:5,	award [4] - 25:7, 29:23,
<u>157 [1] - 1:14</u> <u>175 [1] - 1:17</u>	7 _[1] - 9:2	12:15, 13:24	30:6, 30:17
175[1] - 1.17 19[1] - 35:3	7th [2] - 1:17, 29:2	allege [1] - 12:14	<u>aware [2] - 13:10, 13:25</u>
		<u>alleged [য়া - 8:12, 8:14,</u> 11:20	В
<u>2</u>	8	<u>allow [2] - 22:18, 23:3</u>	<u>B</u>
		Alright [10] - 15:25, 19:8,	bad [3] - 25:5, 25:6, 25:19
2020 [2] - 13:9, 13:25	8 [3] - 7:24, 12:13, 12:14	21:15, 21:21, 22:14, 22:15,	Bar [1] - 24:19
2024 [6] - 1:5, 3:17, 13:16,	<u>80,000 [1] - 11:11</u>	22:23, 22:25, 23:11, 23:16	Barket [2] - 24:10, 24:11
<u>13:17, 14:22, 35:3</u>	<u>89 [1] - 3:12</u>	alternative [1] - 7:18	<u>barred [1] - 15:2</u>
20th [1] - 29:2	0	<u>amenable [1] - 27:5</u>	Barwick [4] - 2:3, 2:9, 2:10,
22 [1] - 4:14 24-21119 [1] - 2:2	<u>9</u>	amend [13] - 4:1, 4:7, 4:22,	3:23
24-CV-21119-RAR[1] - 1:2	91 [1] - 5:13	4:25, 5:22, 7:11, 17:22,	<u>based [3] - 7:8, 18:19,</u>
2410 [1] - 1:18	93 [1] - 3:12	<u>18:16, 19:3, 23:4, 24:13,</u> 26:20, 27:6	<u>19:20</u> basis [2] - 19:2, 20:13
26 [1] - 13:9		<u>20.20, 27.6</u> amended [17] - 3:13, 13:14,	basis [2] - 19.2, 20.13 bear [1] - 6:10
28th [2] - 29:3, 31:4	<u>A</u>	17:12, 20:23, 21:1, 21:19,	became [2] - 13:9, 21:13
2nd [1] - 33:14		23:7, 23:23, 25:23, 26:2,	BEFORE [1] - 1:10
	<u>a.m [3] - 1:6, 34:20</u> Abbot [1] - 14:6	27:24, 28:15, 29:3, 29:15,	beginning [3] - 2:4, 13:9,
<u>3</u>	ability [4] - 5:14, 5:16, 8:3,	<u>31:7, 31:19, 31:21</u>	<u>16:3</u>
3 [2] - 7:24, 8:10	18:13	amendment [6] - 4:20,	behalf [3] - 2:6, 2:9, 34:4
30 [1] - 11:10	able [6] - 4:2, 9:11, 14:2,	7:22, 8:9, 9:20, 9:24, 12:18	<u>believes [1] - 4:19</u>
305 [2] - 1:24, 35:7	20:16, 31:8, 33:4	amends [1] - 10:23	benefit [1] - 11:14
32789 [1] - 1:15	above-entitled [1] - 35:1	<u>amount [1] - 16:18</u> answer [5] - 20:3, 20:20,	best [3] - 27:13, 31:11,
33128 _[2] - 1:24, 35:7	absolutely [2] - 11:18,	29:14, 29:16, 31:12	31:15 bet [1] - 10:20
33130 [1] - 1:18	<u>15:21</u>	answered [1] - 20:15	bet [1] - 10.20 better [3] - 14:6, 18:1,
35 [4] - 11:3, 12:7, 12:24,	accurate [1] - 34:25	anyway [1] - 32:17	27:20
<u>12:25</u>	Act [2] - 26:11, 33:1 action [3] - 17:5, 17:17,	apart [1] - 21:9	between [6] - 7:5, 9:7, 15:9,
<u>37 [1] - 12:7</u>	20:11	<u>apologize [1] - 6:1</u>	<u>15:23, 18:12</u>
<u>375 [1] - 1:15</u>	20.11 activities[1] - 11:20	APPEARANCES[1] - 1:11	BEUSSE [1] - 1:14
A	<u>activity [2] - 8:3, 8:7</u>	appearances [1] - 2:4	Beusse [1] - 2:6
<u>4</u>	acts [2] - 3:8, 3:15	appreciate [1] - 29:22	<u>beyond [1] - 14:4</u>
40 [1] - 12:25	actual [2] - 8:18, 16:12	appropriate [4] - 24:14,	big [1] - 22:17
400 [2] - 1:23, 35:6	add [5] - 7:9, 8:15, 8:19,	24:15, 25:16, 30:18 argue[3] - 21:10, 22:8,	bigger [3] - 10:8, 10:9, 26:9
43 [2] - 3:16, 13:15	<u>8:20, 30:25</u>	<u>argue (3) - 21.10, 22.6,</u> 24:15	biggest [1] - 10:6 bit [9] - 3:2, 6:16, 7:4, 8:9,
<u>48 [1] - 34:17</u>	added [1] - 13:14	<u>arguing [2] - 7:18, 24:20</u>	9:1, 9:5, 12:21, 23:10, 32:23
	additional [2] - 12:18, 14:4	ARGUMENT[1] - 1:9	black[1] - 13:24
<u>5</u>	address [5] - 2:15, 3:25,	argument [3] - 2:21, 4:19,	Black[2] - 14:6, 14:14
5 [1] - 7:24	4:4, 4:18, 10:1 addressing [2] - 4:6, 4:23	<u>15:15</u>	black-and-white [1] - 13:24
5 [1] - 7.24 504 [2] - 27:19, 31:1	<u>addressing [2] - 4.6, 4.23</u> <u>adds [1] - 13:16</u>	arguments [2] - 2:17, 9:25	blueprint [1] - 7:10
504 [2] - 27.13, 51.1	adeguacy[1] - 2:19	arrangement [1] - 15:9	books [1] - 34:11
22 1/2 12 10 111		<u>article [1] - 24:19</u>	

Box [2] - 14:6, 14:14 boxed [1] - 14:23 breach[1] - 20:11 brief [4] - 5:12, 22:7, 23:8, 27:1 briefing [1] - 34:16 bring [4] - 11:12, 17:22, 19:2, 24:14 bringing [4] - 14:24, 21:4, 21:5, 22:21 Brothers [1] - 10:8 brought [3] - 3:9, 19:10, 19:14 Browne [1] - 10:22 bucks [2] - 16:14, 16:15 bunch [3] - 11:13, 12:4, <u>15:6</u> bundle [1] - 16:2 burden [1] - 6:13 Business[1] - 27:10 busy [1] - 32:22 button[1] - 22:12 BWP_[2] - 5:8, 5:9 BY [1] - 1:19

C

calendar [2] - 29:8, 32:12 California [1] - 10:6 cannot [2] - 4:19, 9:23 care [1] - 9:20 carefully [1] - 15:3 cart [1] - 23:8 Case[1] - 2:2 CASE [1] - 1:2 case [40] - 3:5, 5:8, 5:9, 10:5, 10:7, 10:25, 11:2, 11:5, <u>14:5, 14:14, 14:17, 15:22,</u> <u>15:23, 16:20, 18:7, 18:10,</u> <u>18:17, 19:3, 19:10, 19:21,</u> 19:24, 19:25, 20:1, 21:6, 21:14, 22:1, 22:9, 22:16, 22:17, 23:11, 23:16, 24:12, 26:4, 26:15, 26:16, 29:6, 30:3, 31:2, 33:1 cases [5] - 14:4, 19:14, 25:13, 27:17, 33:1 category [2] - 3:4, 3:10 Central [1] - 10:6 centric [1] - 2:18 cents_[1] - 27:18 certain [1] - 31:8 certainly [19] - 4:21, 4:25, <u>5:6, 8:18, 12:11, 12:17,</u> 12:20, 17:8, 17:11, 18:5, <u>18:13, 23:3, 23:6, 25:11,</u> 25:23, 27:14, 27:18, 30:14, 34:5 certify [1] - 34:24 cetera [1] - 7:9

21:23

concerning [1] - 8:16

challenge [4] - 7:7, 14:3, 14:19, 14:25 challenges [1] - 33:24 chance [2] - 23:4, 30:19 cheaper [1] - 26:5 Chief [1] - 30:3 child[1] - 28:19 chopped [1] - 32:23 chunk[1] - 22:17 circuit [1] - 12:20 Circuit [2] - 3:5, 8:2 citation [1] - 25:6 cited [4] - 5:8, 11:4, 14:4, 24:20 claim [21] - 3:9, 4:7, 6:14, 7:23, 12:14, 13:23, 14:9, <u>14:20, 15:1, 15:2, 15:25,</u> <u>16:6, 16:7, 16:10, 16:16,</u> 16:24, 17:10, 17:11, 20:13, <u>21:9</u> claiming [1] - 15:16 claims [5] - 3:6, 6:3, 17:22, 23:19, 26:9 clarify[1] - 8:18 clean [2] - 9:4, 18:5 cleaner [1] - 18:9 clear [7] - 8:2, 19:6, 25:2, 25:4, 29:23, 32:11 Cleveland [1] - 10:21 client [2] - 15:24, 34:4 clients [1] - 14:23 clock[1] - 14:22 collectable [1] - 11:15 collectible [1] - 11:16 collectively [3] - 3:18, 5:14, 13:18 color [1] - 11:4 coming [6] - 13:6, 21:2, 21:3, 22:13, 26:14, 31:9 committed [3] - 4:3, 5:15, 5:21 company [4] - 11:8, 11:9, 11:12, 11:22 company's [1] - 11:23 compensate [1] - 25:8 competition[1] - 21:4 complaint [31] - 2:23, 2:25, 3:2, 3:11, 3:13, 3:17, 4:3, 4:7, 8:18, 13:5, 13:13, 13:15, <u>14:15, 15:3, 17:12, 18:6,</u> 20:24, 21:20, 22:3, 23:7, 23:23, 26:2, 26:3, 27:6, 27:24, 28:16, 29:3, 29:15, 31:7, 31:19, 31:22 complaint's [1] - 25:23 completed [1] - 31:13 concern [2] - 3:22, 22:5 concerned [2] - 14:17,

concerns [1] - 9:21 conclusory [2] - 5:17, 8:10 conduct [3] - 5:15, 5:21, 6:18 confer [1] - 29:7 conference [17] - 26:4, 26:15, 26:23, 27:6, 27:8, 28:4, 29:7, 29:11, 29:16, 30:16, 30:20, 31:14, 31:23, 31:24, 33:9, 33:10, 33:16 confused [1] - 4:15 connection[1] - 19:15 consider [1] - 8:17 consolidated[1] - 18:24 Constantine [1] - 10:22 continue[1] - 18:7 contract [3] - 19:5, 20:11, <u>21:18</u> contractual_[2] - 20:7, 20:10 control [4] - 6:7, 9:5, 9:8, 12:10 controlling [1] - 6:6 conversations[1] - 26:17 copied [3] - 3:18, 13:19, 20:17 copy [1] - 14:11 copying [1] - 13:11 copyright [5] - 10:6, 12:11, 14:9, 14:16, 15:12 Copyright [1] - 26:11 copyrighted [1] - 20:9 copyrights [3] - 11:1, 21:4, copywrite [2] - 16:12, 20:16 Copywrited [3] - 3:19, 13:11, 13:20 core [7] - 15:1, 15:12, <u>15:16, 16:24, 17:4, 19:24,</u> 20:1 correct [6] - 4:1, 11:18, <u>15:21, 17:19, 20:7, 32:1</u> correctly [1] - 13:22 cost [3] - 28:6, 28:7, 34:2 costs [1] - 30:24 counsel[1] - 2:5 count [2] - 7:16, 8:22 Count [2] - 7:24, 8:10 country [1] - 10:7 counts [7] - 6:23, 7:15, 20:24, 21:5, 21:7, 22:19, 22:22 county [3] - 17:17, 18:11, 34:8 couple [5] - 2:16, 14:3, 24:6, 27:3, 32:9

course [4] - 8:17, 18:24,

10:11, 17:3, 22:6, 22:9,

Court [13] - 1:21, 1:22, 2:1,

29:21, 30:21

22:19, 27:22, 31:10, 34:20, 35:4, 35:5 COURT_[62] - 1:1, 2:2, 2:8, 2:14, 4:11, 4:17, 5:6, 6:11, 7:14, 7:17, 7:20, 8:24, 9:13, 9:16, 10:4, 10:8, 10:10, 10:14, 10:17, 12:6, 12:9, 13:2, 16:2, 16:14, 16:21, 17:20, 17:24, 19:7, 19:9, 19:15, 19:19, 19:23, 20:25, 21:2, 21:7, 21:12, 21:16, 21:19, 22:2, 22:24, 23:24, 24:2, 24:22, 27:13, 28:6, 28:9, 28:21, 28:23, 29:1, 29:21, 29:24, 30:8, 30:12, 32:1, 32:4, 32:16, 32:22, 33:6, 33:18, 33:23, 34:15, 34.19 court [24] - 6:12, 17:5, <u>17:17, 18:11, 18:18, 19:6,</u> <u>19:10, 19:11, 19:13, 19:17,</u> 19:23, 19:25, 20:4, 20:15, 21:8, 21:14, 22:3, 22:15, 22:18, 25:20, 30:6, 33:15, 33:24, 34:8 covered[1] - 9:25 creates [1] - 11:13 creation [1] - 14:17 CRR [2] - 1:20, 35:4 cured_[2] - 4:20, 9:2 current[1] - 7:12

D damage [2] - 26:11, 30:25 damages [4] - 16:12, 16:13, 17:7, 20:16 **DARRYL**[1] - 1:4 **DATE**[1] - 35:3 date [8] - 28:18, 31:22, 33:1, 33:8, 33:25, 34:5, 34:6, 34:7 dates [1] - 34:11 days_[4] - 17:13, 18:18, 31:13, 32:9 deadline [4] - 26:19, 29:3, 29:4, 29:13 deal [3] - 2:18, 12:2, 26:23 dealing [2] - 12:12, 15:17 deals [1] - 12:12 debating [1] - 19:24 dec [2] - 17:17, 20:11 December [1] - 13:9 decide [2] - 4:23, 23:16 declaration[1] - 18:9 declaratory[2] - 18:19, 24:11 defend [2] - 10:18, 25:8 Defendant [1] - 13:10 defendant [9] - 3:14, 5:18,

7:6, 8:6, 8:16, 11:9, 11:15, doubt[1] - 33:3 explain [2] - 10:21, 12:13 four [1] - 3:14 11:16, 21:14 down [4] - 11:3, 16:12, explanation [1] - 5:10 fourth [1] - 3:4 defendant's [1] - 8:13 18:15, 26:17 explicit [1] - 25:19 framed[2] - 2:25, 20:14 **DEFENDANT'S** [1] - 1:9 download_[2] - 3:19, 13:19 expressed [1] - 11:7 frankly [3] - 6:17, 11:14, defendants [12] - 2:13, draft [3] - 7:14, 8:8, 13:6 32:6 extend[1] - 29:13 2:16, 3:7, 3:9, 3:15, 3:17, drafts [1] - 28:12 extensive[1] - 15:23 free [1] - 30:23 5:13, 8:11, 11:1, 14:10, duck [2] - 19:17, 30:6 extensively [1] - 26:18 freestanding [1] - 15:1 15:10 front [7] - 3:11, 18:21, 22:4, Defendants [2] - 1:8, 13:18 Ε F 22:6, 28:14, 32:15, 32:20 **DEFENDANTS**[1] - 1:16 fundamentally[1] - 18:10 early [4] - 26:8, 27:9, 27:19, failure[1] - 7:4 defense [2] - 2:21, 9:23 27:24 Fair [1] - 33:1 definitely [3] - 6:11, 9:7, G easier[1] - 29:18 fair [2] - 7:20, 13:2 game [3] - 9:19, 28:10, 33:7 delineate [1] - 7:4 easiest [1] - 2:22 faith [3] - 25:5, 25:6, 25:19 easily [1] - 31:1 Gayles[1] - 32:21 detail [1] - 8:15 falling [1] - 14:12 easy [2] - 16:9, 20:5 generate[1] - 17:9 detailed [1] - 11:5 far [1] - 5:18 glad [2] - 10:14, 10:17 determination[3] - 21:8, eclipse [1] - 31:1 favor [2] - 12:25, 24:12 goal [1] - 32:10 economy [2] - 5:6, 20:22 federal [4] - 16:20, 19:11, 22:14, 30:15 determine [1] - 19:25 edifying [1] - 17:2 grand [1] - 27:3 19:13, 22:1 education [1] - 27:16 grant [1] - 31:20 direct [5] - 5:19, 8:4, 8:6, fee [3] - 24:25, 29:23, 30:17 effective [4] - 28:6, 28:7, granted [1] - 4:22 11:21, 12:16 fees [6] - 19:18, 25:7, 27:2, directly [2] - 8:7, 11:20 34:3 30:7, 30:15, 31:1 gravamen [2] - 14:9, 14:20 disagree [5] - 14:8, 15:20, effectively [1] - 32:13 few [3] - 9:20, 26:2, 32:22 great [2] - 28:8, 34:15 16:4, 21:17, 30:17 effort[1] - 18:8 **GROUP**[1] - 1:7 fight [3] - 15:18, 17:4, 18:21 either_[2] - 23:8, 29:13 disagreed[1] - 10:11 figure [7] - 3:14, 3:21, 4:2, Group [2] - 2:10, 13:10 discovery [5] - 6:5, 6:9, element [3] - 9:8, 9:9, 12:10 17:8, 18:18, 20:2, 20:8 guess [5] - 4:5, 13:4, 15:16, 6:21, 7:2, 14:21 Eleventh [2] - 3:5, 8:1 file [14] - 4:8, 4:12, 7:13, 21:24, 22:5 14:2, 17:13, 21:20, 22:12, discretion [2] - 23:10, eliminate [1] - 26:17 guessing [2] - 11:17, 20:19 25:16 elsewhere [1] - 15:8 23:12, 28:15, 29:16, 30:1, guidance [2] - 12:19, 12:22 discretionary [1] - 22:8 email [2] - 4:14, 19:12 30:23, 31:19 guide [1] - 22:18 filed [9] - 2:16, 10:2, 18:2, discussed [1] - 26:21 enable [1] - 14:22 guys [14] - 18:17, 23:13, discussion [1] - 12:10 19:13, 21:25, 25:1, 26:2, encompassed [1] - 20:1 26:14, 28:10, 29:7, 29:12, disgorgement [1] - 16:18 encourage [2] - 12:21, 28:5 27:24, 31:8 30:19, 31:23, 32:11, 33:4, files [1] - 31:21 33:9, 34:5, 34:9, 34:15 dismiss[1] - 2:15 end_[2] - 16:17, 24:20 filing [4] - 27:4, 29:14, **DISMISS** [1] - 1:9 engage [2] - 20:2, 30:13 Н dismissed[1] - 7:24 engaged [2] - 3:15, 5:19 financial [6] - 8:4, 8:6, 8:13, displayed [2] - 3:19, 13:19 England [1] - 1:14 hair_[1] - 11:10 8:16, 11:21, 11:22 displaying [1] - 13:11 ensure [1] - 5:16 handle [1] - 27:17 fine [3] - 7:20, 27:19, 28:24 dispute[1] - 15:4 enter [1] - 34:10 handling [1] - 27:16 finer [1] - 5:3 disputed [1] - 14:12 Enterprises [1] - 2:11 Hanzman [1] - 32:15 finger [1] - 3:24 disservice [1] - 19:22 entitled [2] - 16:18, 35:1 first [5] - 18:2, 20:23, 23:12, happily [1] - 29:17 distinct [1] - 21:20 Entry[1] - 3:13 happy [6] - 17:12, 26:13, 28:19, 32:2 distribute[1] - 14:11 essential [2] - 11:7, 11:8 30:12, 30:21, 30:22, 31:4 fit [1] - 15:15 distributing [1] - 13:11 Essential [8] - 2:9, 6:7, 7:5, five [1] - 3:14 hard [2] - 12:3, 20:8 distribution [2] - 11:23, 9:7, 13:10, 15:6, 15:8, 15:24 flaw [1] - 4:1 harm [1] - 25:14 11:24 **ESSENTIAL**[1] - 1:7 District [5] - 1:22, 1:22, fleshed [1] - 9:10 hear [3] - 17:25, 32:10, 33:7 essentially [4] - 19:12, heard [1] - 32:11 fleshing[1] - 6:19 10:6, 35:5, 35:5 19:21, 20:2, 31:11 hearing [3] - 4:9, 30:15, FLORIDA[1] - 1:1 **DISTRICT** [3] - 1:1, 1:1, et_[3] - 1:7, 2:3, 7:9 Florida [8] - 1:4, 1:15, 1:18, <u>1:10</u> evaluate [1] - 30:10 1:22, 1:24, 24:19, 35:5, 35:7 hearings [1] - 32:19 **DIVISION**[1] - 1:2 event[1] - 13:23 flow [1] - 21:8 heart [1] - 14:17 Docket [2] - 3:13, 4:14 exact [3] - 7:10, 22:3, 26:16 flows [2] - 21:22, 21:25 heightened [1] - 6:15 doctrines [1] - 22:8 exactly [2] - 6:5, 17:8 held [1] - 6:22 followed [1] - 11:4 documents [1] - 20:7 example [6] - 3:16, 5:11, help [2] - 5:7, 34:11 FOR [2] - 1:13, 1:16 dollars [1] - 27:18 5:13, 6:21, 6:22, 8:5 foregoing [1] - 34:24 helpful[1] - 17:2 dollars-and-cents [1] excellent [2] - 9:13, 26:13 helps_[1] - 7:17 forward [3] - 18:25, 27:25, <u> 27:18</u> exercise[1] - 26:25 hereby [1] - 34:24 32:6 done [4] - 17:14, 18:12, exercising [1] - 25:15 foul [1] - 25:14 Honor [19] - 2:12, 4:5, 9:12, 28:11, 33:19 expect[1] - 23:9 10:2, 11:7, 11:18, 12:24,

15:22, 17:19, 24:17, 24:19, 27:7, 28:25, 33:5, 33:11, 33:12, 34:13, 34:14, 34:18 HONORABLE [1] - 1:10 Honorable [1] - 1:21 hope [2] - 4:25, 7:11 hopeful [1] - 8:9 hopefully [1] - 32:24 hoping [1] - 4:12 horse [1] - 23:8 hours [1] - 34:17 hundred [1] - 24:6

Ī

idea [2] - 7:8, 28:8

identify [1] - 5:23 **II**[2] - 1:10, 1:21 illegally [2] - 3:18, 13:18 ILONA [2] - 1:20, 35:4 impact [5] - 18:10, 18:13, 22:16, 22:25, 23:11 important [1] - 13:17 incident [1] - 5:19 included [1] - 22:15 includes_[1] - 24:4 indeed [1] - 20:12 indirect [2] - 11:22, 11:24 individual_[1] - 7:16 individually [4] - 3:18, 5:14, 7:6, 13:18 individuals [3] - 10:24, 11:6, 11:19 infringement [10] - 5:19, 5:20, 6:23, 7:23, 8:14, 9:9, 12:11, 13:25, 14:16, 14:22 infringements [1] - 8:12 infringing [5] - 5:15, 5:21, 8:3, 8:7, 11:20 inside [1] - 10:10 instead [1] - 27:21 interest [4] - 8:4, 8:13, 11:21, 11:22 interests [2] - 8:6, 8:16 interpretation[1] - 20:10 intertwined [2] - 21:12, 21:13 invoke [1] - 22:9 involved [2] - 11:20, 33:21 **IP**_[1] - 27:11 issue [26] - 2:24, 4:24, 7:23, 9:3, 9:16, 9:17, 12:2, 15:11, <u>15:13, 15:15, 15:21, 17:13,</u> 19:6, 19:24, 25:20, 25:24, 26:21, 26:22, 27:9, 27:18, 29:4, 31:6, 33:7, 33:9 issues [2] - 4:23, 9:6 issuing [1] - 27:21 itself [2] - 4:14, 25:17

<u>J</u>

jam [1] - 28:12 Johnson [1] - 14:5 joint [2] - 29:12, 31:10 joke [1] - 10:10 Journal [1] - 24:19 judge [9] - 20:19, 23:17, 26:5, 26:6, 26:12, 27:15, 31:14, 33:20, 34:8 Judge [11] - 24:10, 24:11, 26:12, 29:8, 30:4, 31:8, 31:22, 32:15, 32:20, 32:24, 33:10 JUDGE [1] - 1:10 judgment [3] - 6:24, 18:19, 20:6 judicial [2] - 5:6, 20:21 July [5] - 4:15, 28:18, 32:9, 33:14, 34:6 jump [1] - 2:23 June [3] - 1:5, 4:14, 35:3 jurisdiction [2] - 25:11, 25:17 jurisdictional [1] - 19:2 jurist [1] - 26:12

<u>K</u>

keep [3] - 10:18, 30:24,
34:2
kept [1] - 18:22
key [1] - 30:24
kind [8] - 5:17, 7:3, 12:15,
15:16, 17:9, 26:11, 30:5,
32:5
Klein [2] - 2:10
Kleins [1] - 3:23
knows [5] - 15:22, 17:4,
27:11, 27:19, 33:23

L

Labor [1] - 33:1

lack[1] - 18:1 language [4] - 6:1, 6:2, 8:10, 12:11 last [3] - 10:2, 12:6, 28:19 Latin [1] - 11:2 LAW [1] - 1:17 law [3] - 11:4, 11:25, 27:11 Law_[1] - 27:10 lead [1] - 26:16 learned[3] - 3:17, 13:16, 13:17 least [12] - 3:2, 4:13, 5:2, 5:9, 5:23, 8:10, 12:19, 22:18, 26:15, 28:20, 30:9, 30:10 leave [7] - 4:1, 4:22, 6:12, 9:21, 10:23, 18:6, 34:9

legal [2] - 2:20, 8:11 liability [3] - 8:22, 9:4, 12:16 liable_[1] - 6:25 license [7] - 14:11, 15:23, 18:20, 20:9, 20:17, 21:22, 22:16 licensed [2] - 15:6, 24:7 licensing [13] - 14:21, 15:7, <u>15:9, 15:11, 15:17, 15:18,</u> <u>15:21, 16:7, 16:24, 17:4,</u> 18:12, 19:25, 24:4 likelihood [1] - 32:16 limitation [2] - 16:9, 17:1 <u>limitations</u> [9] - 2:21, 4:19, 9:18, 9:23, 12:3, 13:4, 14:1, 14:13, 26:11 limited [1] - 16:18 line [3] - 12:20, 24:4, 26:17 listed [1] - 24:6 listen [1] - 32:10 litigate [5] - 17:15, 18:4, 23:13, 23:19 litigated [1] - 22:10 litigating [2] - 10:5, 17:23 litigation [4] - 11:13, 12:4, 18:9, 20:2 LLC [1] - 1:7 look [9] - 12:23, 14:14, 22:5, 22:19, 23:6, 26:6, 30:23, 31:5, 34:1 looked [3] - 12:6, 14:3, 15:3 looking [3] - 3:11, 20:4, looks [2] - 15:18, 23:5 **Lott** [1] - 14:5 Lott-Johnson [1] - 14:5 loud [1] - 32:11 Louis [7] - 26:13, 28:4, 29:8, 31:8, 31:22, 32:24, <u>33:10</u> low [1] - 30:25 lumped [1] - 6:20

M

LUPOWITZ [2] - 1:20, 35:4

Lupowitz [1] - 35:3

Magistrate [3] - 28:4, 29:7, 33:10
magistrate [4] - 26:5, 26:12, 27:15, 31:14
maintained [1] - 4:1
majority [1] - 22:21
Maluma [1] - 11:2
manager [1] - 7:9
managers [1] - 6:6
Mark [1] - 27:10
material [1] - 23:11
materially [1] - 22:16

matter_[4] - 2:3, 4:18, 4:22, mattresses [1] - 18:4 mean_[7] - 3:25, 18:20, 20:5, 20:7, 21:1, 22:5, 25:22 meaning [1] - 20:15 means [1] - 14:1 Media [3] - 2:10, 5:9, 13:10 MEDIA[1] - 1:7 mediate[2] - 32:13, 32:15 mediation [7] - 26:5, 27:9, 27:20, 27:24, 28:3, 32:8, 32:19 mediator [2] - 27:8, 27:9 meet_[1] - 29:7 member [2] - 6:6, 7:9 memorializes [1] - 17:14 memorializing [1] - 26:21 memory[1] - 17:16 MIAMI[2] - 1:2, 1:17 Miami_[6] - 1:4, 1:18, 1:23, 1:24, 35:6, 35:7 might [5] - 7:2, 20:5, 26:17, 29:18, 34:6 mind [1] - 33:15 minute [1] - 4:21 moment [1] - 26:20 Monday [1] - 20:19 money [4] - 16:18, 24:24, 25:22, 34:3 month_[1] - 29:11 months [3] - 26:14, 31:9, 32:22 morning [5] - 2:8, 2:12, 2:14, 2:17, 20:19 most [1] - 13:17 motion [14] - 2:15, 7:25, 8:21, 19:13, 22:6, 23:9, 24:11, 24:25, 26:25, 29:12, <u>29:14, 30:1, 30:15, 31:10</u> MOTION [1] - 1:9 motions[1] - 24:14 move [3] - 19:13, 26:18, 30:18 MR_[62] - 2:6, 2:12, 4:5, 4:12, 5:4, 5:25, 7:12, 7:15, 7:18, 8:20, 9:12, 9:14, 10:2, 10:5, 10:9, 10:13, 10:16, 10:21, 12:8, 12:24, 15:20, 16:4, 16:15, 17:19, 17:21, 19:5, 19:8, 19:10, 19:16, 19:20, 20:23, 21:1, 21:3, 21:10, 21:13, 21:17, 21:24, 22:21, 23:22, 23:25, 24:3, 27:7, 28:3, 28:7, 28:17, 28:22, 28:25, 29:20, 29:22, 29:25, 30:9, 31:24, 32:2, 32:14, 32:20, 33:5, 33:11, 33:12, 33:22, 34:13, 34:14, 34:18

pays[1] - 11:23

pending [1] - 22:9

pennies_[1] - 24:21

multiple [2] - 3:6, 3:7 music [3] - 3:20, 11:2, 13:20 must [1] - 8:3

<u>N</u>

named [1] - 7:6 nature [2] - 17:10, 22:3 Nealy [6] - 10:8, 10:9, 10:10, 10:12, 10:16, 31:25 necessarily [2] - 3:14, 18:15 need [15] - 4:24, 6:14, 8:5, <u>9:7, 9:8, 9:9, 12:15, 17:12,</u> <u>26:17, 26:20, 27:7, 28:11, </u> 28:15, 28:21, 31:20 needs [1] - 6:18 negotiate [2] - 30:19, 34:9 negotiation [1] - 31:18 new [1] - 14:21 New_[1] - 1:14 next [5] - 25:21, 26:2, 26:23, 29:11, 34:17 night [2] - 10:2, 12:6 nine [1] - 10:20 NO_[1] - 1:2 North [2] - 1:23, 35:6 nothing [3] - 16:21, 21:17, 24:21 notice[2] - 4:15, 10:3 nuance[1] - 5:10 number[1] - 22:8 numbers [2] - 26:7, 27:4

<u>O</u>

objection [1] - 28:24 obtained [1] - 8:11 odd [1] - 23:21 OF [1] - 1:1 Official [2] - 1:21, 35:4 omissions [2] - 3:8, 3:15 omit [1] - 13:16 ON [1] - 1:9 once [6] - 6:9, 24:14, 27:6, 31:7, 33:9, 34:5 one [23] - 2:19, 3:3, 3:9, <u>4:25, 7:1, 9:6, 11:19, 14:6,</u> <u>14:16, 14:21, 15:7, 15:25,</u> 18:23, 19:3, 21:2, 21:3, 23:15, 23:17, 25:25, 29:2, 29:20, 32:25 ones [2] - 14:4, 14:7 operating[1] - 26:3 operative [1] - 18:5 opinion_[2] - 11:3, 12:5 opportunity [1] - 4:7 opted [1] - 4:8 ORAL [1] - 1:9

Orchard [9] - 2:11, 3:24, 7:5, 7:6, 8:16, 8:22, 9:3, 9:7, 9:15 Orchards [1] - 10:23 order[21] - 4:13, 4:14, 4:16, 5:12, 17:13, 25:4, 26:21, 26:22, 27:22, 27:23, 28:14, 29:4, 29:5, 29:6, 30:9, 30:11, 31:6, 33:7, 33:10, 34:10 Order [1] - 2:1 orders [2] - 34:10, 34:16 original [2] - 13:15, 18:23 originally [1] - 28:17 outgoing [1] - 27:10 outside[1] - 14:2 overlap [1] - 25:13 overlitigate[1] - 31:2 own [1] - 24:5 owned_[1] - 15:5 owner [1] - 11:22 owners [1] - 11:12 ownership_[12] - 13:23, 14:10, 14:18, 14:19, 15:1, 15:2, 15:4, 15:13, 15:15, 15:17, 15:19, 16:6

Ρ

P.A_[1] - 1:17 page [6] - 7:24, 9:2, 11:3, 12:7, 12:24, 23:2 Pages [1] - 1:8 pages [2] - 12:7, 12:25 paid [1] - 16:16 paired [2] - 26:4, 26:12 papers_[1] - 27:4 paragraph [5] - 3:12, 3:16, 5:13, 13:9, 13:15 Park[1] - 1:15 parking [1] - 16:16 parse [3] - 5:1, 6:24, 12:16 parsing [1] - 6:23 part [11] - 5:13, 13:4, 13:17, <u>15:8, 16:2, 18:11, 18:20,</u> 20:9, 21:15, 21:21, 24:22 partial [1] - 6:24 particular [5] - 2:19, 3:12, 4:24, 18:11, 18:19 particularly [1] - 9:18 parties [9] - 18:12, 23:8, 27:21, 27:23, 31:9, 31:13, 32:7, 32:13, 33:2 party [1] - 25:8 patent [2] - 6:2, 6:3 Paul [1] - 2:10 pause [3] - 22:12, 23:15, 29:15 pay [1] - 19:18 **PAYNE** [1] - 1:4

Payne [3] - 2:3, 15:5, 15:6

per [1] - 7:16 permission [1] - 29:25 pertain [1] - 22:22 pick [1] - 34:7 placeholder[1] - 31:17 Plaintiff_[3] - 1:5, 13:9, 13:17 plaintiff [9] - 3:17, 11:1, 13:16, 13:25, 14:16, 15:5, 15:9, 19:22, 21:14 **PLAINTIFF**[1] - 1:13 plaintiff's [2] - 2:5, 14:9 plaintiffs [2] - 2:7, 14:10 plan [3] - 9:19, 28:10, 33:7 platform [2] - 3:20, 13:20 play [1] - 19:4 playing [1] - 32:5 plead [1] - 11:19 pleading [11] - 2:18, 3:4, 3:10, 4:2, 6:12, 6:15, 9:25, 11:6, 12:13, 29:17, 31:12 pleadings [2] - 4:22, 16:9 pleads [1] - 12:1 plenty [1] - 24:16 PLLC [1] - 1:14 point [13] - 5:3, 5:11, 6:4, 7:19, 9:1, 10:22, 14:15, 19:21, 20:5, 21:24, 22:7, 25:22, 34:1 pointed_[8] - 7:24, 9:2, 9:6, 13:22, 14:5, 14:13, 25:6, 26:24 pointing [1] - 7:2 position [4] - 5:20, 21:11, 23:2, 30:5 possibility [1] - 32:12 posted [1] - 20:18 postpone_[1] - 34:7 potential [2] - 23:9, 26:25 poured [1] - 3:1 practicalities [1] - 24:18 practically [1] - 22:11 pragmatic [1] - 16:22 prefer_[1] - 5:4 prepared [1] - 31:10 president[1] - 27:10 pretty [4] - 5:17, 12:10, 12:19, 32:18 primarily [1] - 11:4 problem [5] - 3:3, 3:21, 14:13, 17:1, 30:12 proceedings [1] - 34:25 profit [2] - 8:12, 11:23 profitable [1] - 11:23 profited [1] - 8:7 progress [1] - 7:22

prominent [1] - 11:9 proper [2] - 5:16, 11:9 proposition [1] - 14:7 prove [1] - 11:19 punitive [1] - 25:7 purely [1] - 14:21 put [10] - 3:24, 5:2, 5:12, 16:10, 18:8, 22:12, 25:13, 29:8, 30:16, 31:16 puts [1] - 5:20 putting [5] - 4:21, 8:8, 23:7, 25:21, 32:12

Q

quarterback [1] - 20:19 quite [6] - 3:2, 6:17, 11:14, 23:10, 32:6, 32:23 quote [3] - 3:3, 3:6, 5:13 quote-unquote [1] - 3:3

R

raise [1] - 6:12 raised_[3] - 2:21, 9:25, 22:10 Rama_[2] - 2:10, 3:23 ramping [1] - 32:17 range [1] - 14:2 rather [1] - 11:17 re[1] - 12:1 re-pleads [1] - 12:1 read [4] - 3:16, 12:19, 25:16, 30:22 reading [2] - 13:5, 25:10 ready [1] - 28:13 real[1] - 25:24 really [10] - 2:9, 3:23, 3:24, 10:14, 11:12, 12:7, 12:9, 13:24, 27:7, 33:2 reason [1] - 19:10 recent [1] - 28:3 recessed [1] - 34:20 reconcile[1] - 16:8 reconsider [1] - 30:22 reconsideration [4] - 30:1, 30:13, 31:5, 33:8 recordings [3] - 11:11, 15:24, 24:7 recover[1] - 18:13 refer [2] - 26:4, 29:6 referring[1] - 26:22 regard [1] - 23:9 registered[1] - 16:11 related[1] - 21:5 relationship [1] - 9:6 relationships_[2] - 7:4, 7:8 relief [1] - 24:11 reliving [1] - 10:11 remanded [3] - 15:22, 17:5,

simply [2] - 8:11, 25:7

30:4 remedied_[1] - 9:24 remember[3] - 8:14, 16:11, 19:24 removal [3] - 25:5, 25:9, 25:18 removed [1] - 18:23 removing [1] - 8:23 **REPORTED**[1] - 1:19 Reporter [2] - 1:21, 35:4 represent [2] - 2:13, 11:2 represented [1] - 11:9 representing[1] - 11:10 request[1] - 29:20 required [1] - 25:6 requirements [2] - 8:4, 11:25 requires [1] - 20:10 resolution [1] - 34:4 resolve [1] - 26:15 resolved[1] - 23:15 respect [2] - 9:14, 29:23 respectfully [1] - 26:3 response [3] - 8:15, 8:17, responsible [3] - 3:8, 5:23, responsive [3] - 29:13, 29:17, 31:12 restart[1] - 14:22 RICHARD[1] - 1:16 Richard [1] - 2:12 RMR [2] - 1:20, 35:4 robust [1] - 24:3 Rodolfo [1] - 1:21 RODOLFO [1] - 1:10 role [1] - 8:13 Room_[2] - 1:23, 35:6 Royalties [1] - 14:6 RUIZ_[1] - 1:10 Ruiz [1] - 1:21 rule [1] - 24:11 Rule [2] - 12:13, 12:14 rules [1] - 24:12 running [2] - 10:20, 28:13 rush[1] - 32:18

S

sanction [1] - 25:20 sandbag [1] - 22:7 Sanks [25] - 2:6, 2:8, 2:22, 9:20, 10:1, 10:22, 11:5, 12:1, 12:17, 13:6, 14:8, 16:23, 17:7, 17:25, 23:3, 23:18, 25:2, 26:20, 27:5, 28:11, 29:19, 31:16, 31:21, 33:6 SANKS [37] - 1:13, 1:14, 2:6, 4:5, 4:12, 5:4, 5:25, 7:12, 7:15, 7:18, 8:20, 9:12, 9:14, 19:5, 19:8, 19:10, 19:16, 19:20, 20:23, 21:1, 21:3, 21:10, 21:13, 21:17, 21:24, 22:21, 27:7, 28:17, 28:22, 28:25, 29:20, 29:22, 29:25, 30:9, 33:12, 33:22, 34:13 Sanks's [1] - 14:23 satisfied [1] - 9:19 satisfy [1] - 11:24 saw [3] - 10:4, 12:6, 17:5 schedule [2] - 27:24, 32:25 scheduled [1] - 33:22 scheduling [3] - 27:22, 33:14, 33:23 SE_[1] - 1:17 second [10] - 5:12, 9:9, 20:2, 20:18, 20:19, 21:1, 23:7, 24:22, 25:3, 32:3 second-guessing [1] -20:19 Section [1] - 27:11 **see** [18] - 3:3, 4:9, 13:8, <u>16:23, 17:15, 20:12, 22:13,</u> 22:19, 23:4, 24:13, 24:14, 25:11, 27:2, 33:8, 34:15, 34:18, 34:19 seeing [1] - 13:4 selected [2] - 27:8, 27:10 sell [1] - 14:11 seminal_[1] - 3:5 sense [5] - 7:5, 17:10, 28:1, 28:2, 34:7 sent [2] - 18:1, 19:12 separate [5] - 21:9, 21:20, 26:22, 29:6, 31:6 separate-and-apart [1] separated [2] - 7:15, 22:24 **September**[1] - 32:21 sequentially [1] - 23:20 serves[1] - 17:17 set [5] - 26:13, 29:3, 29:4, 32:9, 32:14 settle [3] - 33:17, 33:18 settlement [16] - 26:4, <u>26:14, 26:22, 27:6, 27:8, </u> 29:6, 29:11, 29:16, 30:16, 30:20, 31:13, 31:23, 31:24, 33:9, 33:10, 33:16 shares [1] - 3:22 Sharon_[1] - 2:10 shocked[1] - 16:19 short[1] - 28:14 shotgun [4] - 2:25, 3:3, 3:4, 3:10

shut [1] - 18:15

silly [1] - 23:12

side [2] - 18:9, 30:16

similar [2] - 30:2, 30:3

situation [1] - 30:3 six [1] - 10:19 someone [4] - 6:22, 10:18, 27:15, 27:19 sometime [1] - 34:6 songs [1] - 14:12 sort [2] - 30:15, 31:5 sound[1] - 11:4 sounds [4] - 7:8, 9:19, 17:9, 20:6 **SOUTHERN**[1] - 1:1 Southern [2] - 1:22, 35:5 space [2] - 17:3, 27:15 speaking [1] - 22:11 speaks [1] - 25:17 specific [2] - 3:15, 8:21 specifically[1] - 24:6 specifying [1] - 3:7 spend [2] - 24:24, 34:3 spliced [1] - 19:1 split [1] - 25:3 **Spotify** [6] - 3:20, 13:21, <u>15:8, 16:10, 16:19, 20:17</u> stage [1] - 7:3 stand[1] - 14:7 standard [1] - 6:15 Standard [1] - 33:1 standards [1] - 12:13 standpoint [1] - 30:2 start [3] - 4:5, 8:15, 14:23 started [1] - 11:10 starting [1] - 32:23 starts [2] - 12:8, 12:9 state [23] - 6:4, 6:14, 15:23, 17:5, 18:11, 18:18, 19:5, 19:10, 19:17, 19:23, 19:25, 20:3, 20:15, 20:20, 21:8, 21:14, 22:3, 22:15, 22:18, 25:20, 30:6, 33:15, 33:23 States_[2] - 1:22, 35:5 STATES[2] - 1:1, 1:10 statute [11] - 2:21, 4:18, 9:18, 9:23, 12:2, 13:4, 14:1, <u>14:12, 17:1, 25:11, 25:17</u> statute-of-limitation [1] -17:1 statute-of-limitations [1] -9:23 stay [11] - 18:17, 19:3, 19:21, 22:9, 23:10, 26:1, 27:1, 29:13, 31:11, 31:12 stayed [1] - 18:23 staying [1] - 33:15

Stein [2] - 27:10, 27:25

step [2] - 8:24, 26:12

sticks [1] - 16:2

<u>- 1:19</u>

STENOGRAPHICALLY[1]

still_[2] - 21:17, 30:17 straight [1] - 17:17 straightforward[1] - 20:6 strategically [1] - 31:3 streams [1] - 17:8 Street[1] - 1:17 structure [1] - 2:23 struggling [1] - 4:3 stuff_[1] - 22:24 styled[1] - 14:16 subject [1] - 7:21 sublicensing [1] - 15:11 subsumed [1] - 24:10 sued [1] - 11:1 sufficiency [1] - 9:25 sufficiently [1] - 12:14 suggest [2] - 25:25, 26:3 suggestion[1] - 18:3 suit [3] - 14:2, 14:20, 14:24 Suite [2] - 1:15, 1:18 summary [2] - 6:24, 20:6 summer [4] - 28:12, 32:21, 32:23, 32:24 **supervise** [3] - 5:15, 8:3, supervision [1] - 9:8 supplemental [4] - 10:3, 19:2, 25:10, 25:17 supports [1] - 21:18 Supreme [1] - 10:11 **survive** [2] - 22:19, 22:22 suspect [1] - 21:22 system [1] - 20:20

T

talks [1] - 14:15 technically [1] - 10:19 tempted [1] - 32:11 terms [2] - 6:16, 31:1 terrific [1] - 28:4 Terry[1] - 2:6 TERRY [1] - 1:13 **THE** [64] - 1:10, 1:13, 1:16, 2:2, 2:8, 2:14, 4:11, 4:17, 5:6, 6:11, 7:14, 7:17, 7:20, 8:24, 9:13, 9:16, 10:4, 10:8, 10:10, 10:14, 10:17, 12:6, <u>12:9, 13:2, 16:2, 16:14,</u> <u>16:21, 17:20, 17:24, 19:7,</u> <u>19:9, 19:15, 19:19, 19:23,</u> 20:25, 21:2, 21:7, 21:12, 21:16, 21:19, 22:2, 22:24, 23:24, 24:2, 24:22, 27:13, 28:6, 28:9, 28:21, 28:23, 29:1, 29:21, 29:24, 30:8, 30:12, 32:1, 32:4, 32:16, 32:22, 33:6, 33:18, 33:23, 34:15, 34:19 therefore [1] - 30:6

they've[1] - 19:11 thinking [2] - 6:12, 26:19 thousand [2] - 16:14, 16:15 three [9] - 6:6, 10:19, 10:24, 11:6, 28:21, 28:22, 28:23, <u> 29:2</u> timely [1] - 16:11 timely-registered [1] -16:11 **TO**[1] - 1:9 today [10] - 2:15, 4:6, 4:23, 12:12, 17:13, 24:15, 25:5, 25:12, 30:5, 34:10 together [5] - 6:20, 8:8, 19:14, 25:13, 31:16 tomorrow[2] - 29:1, 34:10 took [2] - 21:10, 30:5 top[1] - 30:25 touch [1] - 4:6 track[2] - 12:21, 20:2 transcription[1] - 34:25 trial [5] - 31:25, 32:12, 32:17, 32:18, 32:20 Truthfully [1] - 27:20 try [6] - 6:24, 12:13, 12:21, 27:2, 27:5, 32:13 trying [5] - 19:17, 28:12, 30:24, 31:3, 34:2 two [6] - 6:8, 8:4, 19:14, 28:20, 28:21, 29:2 Twombly [1] - 6:14 U

16:17, 22:21, 26:11, 31:1 understood [1] - 25:10 undisputed [1] - 14:17 unfair [1] - 21:4 unfortunately [1] - 25:15 UNITED [2] - 1:1, 1:10 United [2] - 1:22, 35:5 universally [2] - 33:19, 34:2 universe [1] - 26:9 unnecessarily [1] - 17:15 unnecessary [2] - 11:13, 12:5 unquote [1] - 3:3 **up**[9] - 7:15, 9:4, 13:7, 17:17, 20:24, 28:12, 32:17, 32:23, 34:9 updates [1] - 18:17 urge [3] - 10:22, 11:17, 12:1 utilizing [1] - 15:8

under [6] - 12:13, 16:12,

V

value [4] - 17:10, 18:8, 26:16, 31:2 versus [2] - 2:3, 12:16 viable [2] - 6:14, 12:14 vicarious [7] - 5:19, 7:23, 8:22, 9:3, 9:9, 12:10, 12:16 view [2] - 30:10, 34:1 votes [1] - 10:19 vs [1] - 1:6

W

wait [4] - 18:7, 20:12, 29:15, 33:8 wants [1] - 26:25 Warner_[1] - 10:8 waste [3] - 20:21, 27:2, 27:4 Webster [2] - 14:5, 14:14 week[2] - 28:19, 32:3 weeks [5] - 26:2, 28:20, 28:21, 28:22, 28:23 Weiland [1] - 3:5 welcome [2] - 31:5, 31:7 white [1] - 13:24 whole [4] - 11:13, 12:4, 22:17, 33:17 Winter [1] - 1:15 Wolf's [2] - 8:21, 25:22 Wolfe [21] - 2:12, 2:14, 3:22, 4:19, 5:20, 7:23, 9:17, 13:3, 17:3, 17:16, 19:12, 21:15, 22:6, 23:1, 26:9, 26:24, 28:1, 28:13, 30:2, 31:15, 33:13 **WOLFE** [29] - 1:16, 1:17, 2:12, 10:2, 10:5, 10:9, 10:13, 10:16, 10:21, 12:8, 12:24, 15:20, 16:4, 16:15, 17:19, 17:21, 23:22, 23:25, 24:3, 28:3, 28:7, 31:24, 32:2, 32:14, 32:20, 33:5, 33:11, 34:14, 34:18 Wolfe's [1] - 17:9 wonderful [1] - 32:16 wondering [1] - 18:16 word [1] - 18:2 worded_[1] - 8:10 works [5] - 15:5, 15:7, 25:23, 29:8, 34:6 worried [1] - 5:17 worries [2] - 3:10, 20:13 worry [2] - 31:17, 32:19 worth [1] - 18:8 worthwhile [1] - 26:1 writing[1] - 6:3 written [1] - 6:19 wrote_[1] - 24:19

Υ

years [1] - 11:10 you-all [7] - 5:7, 27:14, <u>29:9, 32:11, 34:7, 34:15,</u> <u>34:19</u>

<u>Z</u>

zero [1] - 10:20